DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 230 UD 019 674

AUTHOR Scott, Elois M. Skeen
TITLE Programmatic Needs and Satisfaction of Title I Teachers to the Buffalo, New York Title I Comprehensive Reading and Math Program.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 17p.; For related documents, see UD 019 673-676; Not available in paper copy due to reproduction quality of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; *Compensatory Education Programs; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Programs; Instructional Materials; Parent Participation; Program Administration; *Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Reading Programs; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; New York (Buffalo)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a random sampling of responses to a questionnaire that was sent to teachers in the program. The organization of this report is developed around a statement of each question followed by an analysis of the responses. Taken into consideration are respondents' attitudes toward student selection, inservice programs, materials and supplies, parent participation, regular teacher cooperation and Title I administration. Recommendations made by the Title I teachers for improving the 1978-1979 program are outlined. A sample of the questionnaire distributed to the teachers is included. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177230

Programmatic Needs and Satisfaction of Title I Teachers to the Buffalo, New York Title I Comprehensive Reading and Math Program

by

Elois M. Skeen Scott

197?-1978

University of Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. S. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD019674

In order to determine the perception of Title I teachers of the Comprehensive Reading and Math Program, a questionnaire was distributed. One hundred seventy-seven questionnaires were returned. A random sample of 20% of these questionnaires was drawn for this report.

The organization of this report is developed around a statement of each question and followed by an analysis of the responses. The complete questionnaire is included at the end of the report.

1. How long have you taught in the program?

   The mean length of time teachers had taught in the program was 4.21 years. The mode, which is the most frequently occurring number, was 4.

2. What is your specialty? Reading _____ Math _____

   Of the sample that was drawn, 22 were reading teachers and 20 were math teachers.

3. How satisfied are you with the program in general?

   The possible responses to this question were: Very Satisfied (3), Satisfied (2) and Not Satisfied (1). The mean response was 2.09. Five people said they were very satisfied, two said they were not satisfied, and the rest said they were satisfied.

4. What means of pupil selection do you use? (Checked in order of importance.)

Since these questions were responded to in order of importance, "1" was most important, "2" second in importance, etc. These data are reported in means. Most teachers said that Stanine was the most important criteria. This area had a mean score of 1.8. The second most important area was Informal Testing, with a mean of 1.95. As can be seen, the mean scores of these two areas are very close. Consequently, a clearer picture is obtained by looking at the distribution of scores. For Stanine, 25 people said it was the most important area, and 17 said it was third in importance. No teachers ranked it second or fourth. In the area of Informal Testing, only one person ranked it as the most important. Two people ranked it as the second most important area, 20 people ranked it as the third most important area, 4 people ranked it fourth, and 14 people ranked it as zero in importance.

The area that was ranked third in importance was Previously in the Program. This area had a mean score of 2.04. The area that was ranked least in importance was Teacher Recommendation, with a mean score of 2.81.

5. How satisfied are you with the selection procedure?

Fifteen respondents said they were very satisfied with the program. Twenty respondents said they were satisfied

with the program, and six said they were not satisfied. The mean for this area was 1.79.

6. How would you like to see pupils selected for the program?

The majority of the respondents felt that teacher recommendation (classroom as well as corrective) should be, if not the primary factor, at least equal in weight to the stanine score.

7. What percentage of your students fall in each of the following categories?

These scores are reported as the mean percent in a particular stanine. The mean percentage of students in the first stanine was reported to be 12.58. In the second stanine, the mean was 27.17. The average percent in the third stanine was 36.8, and in the fourth stanine, 22.23.

It is somewhat difficult to interpret what these data mean. For example, do these scores simply reflect that there are more students in the second through the fourth stanine, or does it mean that value judgments were made in terms of which students were selected for instruction? To repeat, it is clear where the largest number of students are drawn from, but the interpretation of this is unclear.

8. How helpful have the inservice programs been?

The respondents in general felt that the inservice

programs had been helpful. The response categories were Very Helpful (3), Helpful (2), and Not Helpful (1). The mean for this area was 2.24.

9. What were the most helpful aspects of the inservices? The most frequently mentioned area was the opportunity to share ideas and concerns. The second most frequently mentioned area was the opportunity to see teacher-made activities and the actual construction of these activities during the inservices. The third most frequently mentioned area was the opportunity to learn about new materials and equipment that are available and to see these demonstrated.

   Many other items were also listed but they were mentioned only once and consequently, were not included. The above areas represent at least 3/4 of the respondents, however.

10. What topics would you like to see covered next year? Following is a list of topics that teachers requested. When there was duplication, the topic was listed only once.

    - New materials for testing
    - Motivation
    - Current issues, e.g., funding, etc.
    - More practical ideas specifically for classroom usage
    - More make-and-take inservices
    - Teacher sharing activities

- Display and discussion of teacher-made materials
- Prominent speakers in reading and math
- New materials and methods of instruction
- Program management and record maintenance
- Ways of involving parents
- Problem solving
- Effective use of calculators
- Various kits and how they can be used
- Creative ideas on the use of hardware, e.g., typewriters
- Coordination with Basal Readers
- Methods of teaching geometry and fractions
- Individualizing instruction
- More topics related to specific reading problems
- How to set up interest centers and how to manage them

11. How adequate are your materials and supplies?

In general, the respondents felt the materials and supplies that were available to them were adequate. The mean for this question was 2.05, with 11 teachers responding that they were Very Adequate (3), 22 responding that the materials and supplies were Adequate (2), and 9 responding that the materials and supplies were Not Adequate (1).

12. What additional materials/supplies would you like to have available?

Following is a short list of materials that were mentioned. These have been included to show the

variety of materials and supplies listed. This type of question is best responded to individually by the coordinators since there appeared to be little consistency in the type of materials needed.

- Trade books
- Work texts
- Games
- Kits
- Filmstrips
- Charts
- Systems 80
- Portable blackboards
- Bookshelves and metal cabinets
- Set of Challenger Books
- Spirit Masters and pencils
- Consumable materials
- Base 10 cubes
- Video-tape machine
- Individualized cassettes

13. How satisfied are you with the parent participation in your program?

The majority of the teachers were dissatisfied with the parent participation in their program. Two teachers said they were Very Satisfied (3), fifteen teachers said they were Satisfied (2), and twenty-four teachers said they were Not Satisfied (1). The mean for this question was 1.46.

14. What have you done to encourage parent participation?

The list of activities below were listed by the teachers. The most outstanding feature of this list is the mundaneness of the type of activity stated. It is not likely that any of these would encourage parents to attend who have traditionally not attended, with the exception of the teacher who stated that he or she attended PAC meetings and those teachers who initiated personal contact through either phone calls or home visitations.

- Parent workshops and inservice programs
- Conferences
- Invitation to accompany children on field trips
- Parent observation day
- Sent home games, booklets, papers, etc. to be discussed
- Showed parents how they can make use of materials they have at home as tools for reading, e.g., newspapers, catalogues, etc.
- Parent-teacher-child picnic
- Personal contacts and telephone checks on the child's progress
- Open House and Metric Clinic
- Attended PAC meetings

15. In what activities do you feel parents can best participate?

Following are the responses that were given. These

responses also indicate a basic distrust of the ability of parents to participate meaningfully. In general, teachers feel that parents' participation should be limited to assisting with homework and accompanying children on field trips.

- Home-school reading programs
- Field trips
- Respond to work sent home with the child
- Show interest and read with the child
- Special programs or activities
- Reinforcing skills at home

16. Do the regular classroom teachers seem to understand your program?

In general, the Title I teachers feel that the regular classroom teachers do understand their program. In response to this question, 30 teachers said Most (3) understood their program, 10 said Some (2) understood their program, and only 2 said that Very Few (1) understood their program. The mean response for this question was 2.67.

17. Do you get the kind of cooperation you need from the regular classroom teachers?

Most Title I teachers felt that they did get the needed cooperation from the regular classroom teachers. Thirty teachers responded Most of the Time (3) to this question, eleven responded Some of the Time (2) and one person responded Hardly Ever (1). The mean for this question was 2.64.

18. Are the Title I administrators responsive to your needs and concerns?

Most teachers felt the administrators were very responsive. Thirty-two felt they were responsive Most of the Time (3), eight felt they were responsive Some of the Time (2) and only two felt they were Hardly Ever (1) responsive. The mean for this question was 2.71.

19. What recommendations do you have for the 1978-1979 program?

Following are listed the recommendations made by the Title I teachers.

- Reduction of the number of children per teacher
- Allow the corrective teacher to take the children out of the classroom
- Entire classrooms should go on field trips rather than pulling out just the Title I children.
- Have the selection criteria include more teacher input
- Increase the amount of diagnostic tools available
- Increase the amount of low-level reading materials
- Increase the amount of visual materials available
- Students in the 4th stanine, not previously serviced, should be included based upon teacher recommendation.
- A different form of the same test at the same level to be used for pre-test, post-test purposes

- Summary check list which would reflect continuous progress
- More inservice meetings which would concentrate on an exchange of ideas
- Time scheduled in for maintaining student folders
- Clarification of the relationship of the generalist to the cluster teacher
- More planning time to meet with aide
- Less duplication of paper work and more time in which to complete it
- Advance notice about paperwork and report deadlines
- Simplified Biographical Data Sheets
- More parent workshops
- More specific types of meetings where corrective teachers can meet with their parents to explain their program, etc.
- The program should concentrate in the primary grades.
- Children who need it should receive help in both math and reading.
- Increased time spent with students
- Opportunity to drop and add students as the need arises

Although all recommendations have been included, the most recurrent were smaller number of children, more planning time, less paper work, and inclusion of all children on field trips.

CONCLUSION

Most of the teachers that responded to this questionnaire were experienced teachers in the program. Consequently, their responses reflect concerns which have some perspective. In general, the teachers seem somewhat satisfied with the program. The areas in which they feel the most improvement needs to take place is in pupil selection and parental participation. In terms of pupil selection, most would like to see teacher recommendations given equal weight to stanine scores. In terms of parent participation, most feel it is very weak but the measures which they have taken to encourage participation also appear to be weak.

One area which was reflected on this questionnaire is one in which I have seen a great deal of improvement over the years--the cooperation of the regular teacher and the Title I teacher. Related to this, the teachers also felt that the Title I administrators were very responsive to their needs and concerns. This is an extremely important area which affects the success or failure of the program.

The teacher recommendation section is also very important and should be read carefully. Unlike many respondents to questionnaires, these teachers took a great deal of time to write down the areas in which they would like to see improvement, and most of these areas express a genuine concern for the educational progress of the child.

The following table reports the means of questions which were coded 1, 2, 3. In all cases, a 3 was the most positive ranking. For example, question 8 refers to the value of the inservice programs. The possible responses were: Very Helpful, which was coded as 3, Helpful, coded 2, and Not Helpful, coded 1. These scores were then tabulated for the sample and mean scores were derived. These items have been individually discussed in the text. They are included here for ease of reading.

Summary Table of Means of Responses

Items	Means
8. How valuable have the inservices been?	2.24
11. How adequate are your materials and supplies?	2.05
13. How satisfied are you with the parent participation?	1.46
16. Do the regular classroom teachers seem to understand the program?	2.67
17. Do you get the kind of cooperation you need from the regular classroom teachers?	2.64
18. Are the Title I administrators responsive to your needs and concerns?	2.71

BUFFALO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Buffalo, New York

COMPREHENSIVE READING & MATHEMATICS PROGRAM

1977-78

Title I Teachers

1. How long have you taught in the program?

2. What is your specialty? Reading_____ Math_____

3. How satisfied are you with the program in general?

   _____Very Satisfied
   _____Satisfied
   _____Not Satisfied

4. What means of pupil selection do you use? (Check all appropriate in order of importance)

   _____Stanine
   _____Teacher Recommendation
   _____Informal Testing
   _____Previously in Program

5. How satisfied are you with the selection procedure?

   _____Very Satisfied
   _____Satisfied
   _____Not Satisfied

6. How would you like to see pupils selected for the program?

7. What percentage of your students fall in each of the following categories?

   _____Stanine 1
   _____Stanine 2
   _____Stanine 3
   _____Stanine 4

8. How helpful have the inservice programs been?

   _____Very Helpful
   _____Helpful
   _____Not Helpful

9. What were the most valuable (helpful) aspects of the inservices?

10. What Topics would you like to see covered next year?

11. How adequate are your materials and supplies?

_____Very Adequate
_____Adequate
_____Not Adequate

12. What additional materials/supplies would you like to have available?

13. How satisfied are you with the parent participation in your program?

_____Very Satisfied
_____Satisfied
_____Not Satisfied

14. What have you specifically done to encourage parent participation?

15. In what activities do you feel parents can best participate?

16. Do the regular classroom teachers seem to understand your program?

_____Most
_____Some
_____Very Few

17. Do you get the kind of cooperation you need from the regular classroom teachers?

_____Most of the Time
_____Some of the Time
_____Hardly Ever

18. Are the Title I administrators responsive to your needs and concerns?

_____Most of the Time
_____Some of the Time
_____Hardly Ever

19. What recommendations do you have for the 1978-79 program?